

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **December 18, 2003** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24 and 26-30. Claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer et al. (“Acoi: A System for Indexing Multimedia Objects”), November 1999, from applicant’s IDS, hereinafter “Windhouwer”), further in view of Massarani (USPN 6,336,117 B1, hereinafter “Massarani”). Claims 2-3, 12-13, and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer, further in view of Massarani, further in view of Nielsen (USPN 5,899,975, hereinafter “Nielsen”). Claims 4, 14, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer, further in view of Massarani, further in view of Burrows (USPN 6,067,543, hereinafter “Burrows”). Claims 6, 16, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer, further in view of Massarani, further in view of Imanaka (USPN 5,471,677, hereinafter “Imanaka”). Claims 7, 17, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer, further in view of Massarani. Claims 8, 18, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer, further in view of Massarani, further in view of Messerly et al. (USPN 6,076,051, hereinafter “Messerly”). Claims 9, 19, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer, further in view of Massarani, further in view of Swift (USPN 5,710,978, hereinafter “Swift”). Claims 10 and 20 and 30 remained rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windhouwer, further in view of Massarani, further in view of Vora et al. (USPN 5,819,273, hereinafter “Vora”).

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Windhouwer in view of Massarani. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Windhouwer and Massarani teaches a technique for **skipping sections of a document** while creating an index for the document (see Massarani, col. 8, lines 52-54, Windhouwer is silent on this point).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to specifying a plurality of tokenizing instructions within an index stylesheet for **tokenizing a plurality of portions of the document**

(see page 9, lines 9-15 of the instant application). Specifying a plurality of tokenizing instructions within an index stylesheet for tokenizing a plurality of portions of the document is beneficial because it allows tokenizing different portions of the document, **each portion using different tokenizing instructions**, which may be, for example, in different languages or from different domains. In this way, a first portion of the document can be tokenized using a first set of tokenizing instructions, and a second portion of the document can be tokenized using a second set of tokenizing instructions. There is nothing within Windhouwer or Massarani, either separately or in concert, which suggests specifying a plurality of tokenizing instructions within an index stylesheet for tokenizing a plurality of portions of the document.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention claims specifying a plurality of tokenizing instructions within an index stylesheet for tokenizing a plurality of portions of the document. These amendments find support on page 9, lines 9-15 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4 and 6-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-14 and claims 16-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-24 and 26-30, which depend upon claim 21 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Reg. No. 47,615

Date: February 11, 2004

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665